

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicant submits herewith a proposed replacement drawing sheet showing a revised Fig. 13. A Replacement Sheet including revised Fig. 13 is included as an attachment, as is an Annotated Sheet showing in detail the change made.

REMARKS

Claim 18 is now listed as cancelled since there was no claim 18 as originally filed.

The specification is amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

Fig. 13 is amended for consistency with the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-17 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 USC §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Halbert, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,493,250. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a data accumulator coupled between a redrive circuit and a memory device. As explained in the specification at page 26, lines 19-21, this type of arrangement may accommodate bandwidth mismatches, for example, with a memory device having a high-bandwidth burst mode.

The Examiner acknowledges that Halbert does not disclose the use of a data accumulator, but the Examiner's basis for concluding that it would have been obvious to use a data accumulator is unclear and unsupported. The Examiner points out that Halbert discusses a prior reference that could operate in a burst mode (col. 1, line 41), but does not identify any prior art reference that discloses a data accumulator. The Examiner makes some additional statements relating to uni-directional versus bi-directional data transfer, but fails to explain how this relates to a data accumulator as recited in claim 1.

The only disclosure of a data accumulator is in Applicant's specification and claims. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is unsupportable because it is based on an impermissible hindsight reconstruction using Applicant's disclosure as a guide. The prior art reference must provide some motivation or suggestion to modify the reference or combine it with another reference to achieve the claimed invention (MPEP 2143.01). The suggestion cannot come from applicant's disclosure (MPEP 2143). As discussed above, Halbert discloses no suggestion or motivation to combine a redrive circuit and a data accumulator. The only teachings of a data accumulator is found in Applicant's disclosure. For at least this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1. Since the rejections of the other independent claims 10, 15 and 22 are based on a similar analysis, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims as either. In the same line, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the claims which depend from claims 1, 10, 15 and 22.

Conclusion

Applicant requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 32231

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Joseph S. Makuch
Reg. No. 39,286

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




FIG.13